



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
[www.uspto.gov](http://www.uspto.gov)

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/017,991	12/14/2001	Tadamasa Yamanaka	B-4436 619405-1	8406
36716	7590	07/06/2006	EXAMINER	
LADAS & PARRY 5670 WILSHIRE BOULEVARD, SUITE 2100 LOS ANGELES, CA 90036-5679				ELAHEE, MD S
		ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER
				2614

DATE MAILED: 07/06/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/017,991	YAMANAKA ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit
	Md S. Elahee	2614

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

#### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 03 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

#### Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 24 April 2006.  
 2a) This action is FINAL.                            2b) This action is non-final.  
 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

#### Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 33-53 is/are pending in the application.  
 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.  
 5) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.  
 6) Claim(s) 33-53 is/are rejected.  
 7) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.  
 8) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

#### Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.  
 10) The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.  
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).  
 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

#### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).  
 a) All    b) Some \* c) None of:  
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.  
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.  
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

#### Attachment(s)

1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____
3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____	5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
	6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____

## **DETAILED ACTION**

### ***Response to Arguments***

1. Applicant's arguments mailed on 04/24/2006 Remarks have been fully considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection which is deemed appropriate to address all of the needs at this time.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

3. The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

4. Claims 39-53 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over **Gormley** (US 5,513,107) in view of **Joao** (US 2002/0016655).

As to Claims 33,38-39,40,45-46,47-53, with respect to Figures 1-2, **Gormley** teaches a parts management system, comprising a mobile unit and a service center, wherein the mobile unit comprises:

a collecting device that collects maintenance and diagnostic data (management information) related to management of parts of the mobile unit (Col. 8, lines 25-30); and

a mobile unit transmitting device that transmits the management information to the service center (Col. 8, lines 25-30), and

wherein the service center comprises

service center analysis (a determining device) that determines whether or not at least one part required for replacement exists in the parts of the mobile unit based on the transmitted management information (Col. 8, lines 34-36);

a service center transmitting device that transmits the part replacement information to the mobile unit;

wherein the mobile unit further comprises a notifying device that notifies the transmitted part replacement information to a user of the mobile unit;

**Gormley** does not teach the following limitation:

“an acquiring device that acquires part replacement information from parts suppliers related to replacement of at least one part required for replacement, in a case where it is determined by the determining device that at least one part required for replacement exists”

However, it is obvious that **Gormley** suggests the limitation. This is because **Gormley** teaches servicing vehicles at a dealer (Col. 8, lines 37-50). **Joao** teaches a central processing computer (acquiring device) that acquires part replacement information from parts suppliers related to replacement of at least one part required for replacement, in a case where it is determined by the determining device that at least one part required for replacement exists (Figure 12C, item 216; page 12, paragraph 0179, page 22, paragraph 0297). Having the cited analogous art at the time the invention was made, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to add part replacement capability to **Gormley**'s invention for having available part replacement of their vehicles for servicing.

**Gormley** does not teach "wherein the part replacement information is information comprising: information identifying said at least one part required for replacement: and information identifying at least one parts supplier dealing with the part required for replacement". **Joao** teaches wherein the part replacement information is information comprising: information identifying the at least one part required for replacement: and information identifying at least one parts supplier dealing with the part required for replacement (Figure 12C, item 216; page 12, paragraph 0179, page 22, paragraphs 0296-0297). Having the cited analogous art at the time the invention was made, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to add the feature of a particular part replacement capability to **Gormley**'s invention for having available a particular part from a particular supplier for a vehicle for servicing.

As to Claims 34-35,41-42, **Gormley** teaches the part management system according to claim 33, **Gormley** does not teach the following limitation:

“wherein the part replacement information is information related to status of the parts supplier's stock of the part required for replacement”

However, it is obvious that **Gormley** suggests the limitation. This is because **Gormley** teaches servicing vehicles at a dealer (Col. 8, lines 37-50). **Joao** teaches wherein the part replacement information is information related to status of the parts supplier's stock of the part required for replacement (page 22, paragraphs 0296-0297,0299). Having the cited analogous art at the time the invention was made, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to add part replacement capability to **Gormley**'s invention for having available vehicle replacement parts as taught by **Joao**'s invention in order to provide service to operators when they bring their vehicles for servicing.

As to Claims 36-37,43-44, **Gormley** teaches the part management system according to claim 33, **Gormley** does not teach the following limitation:

“wherein the part replacement information is information related to labor charges of the parts supplier”

However, it is obvious that **Gormley** suggests the limitation. This is because **Gormley** teaches servicing vehicles at a dealer (Col. 8, lines 37-50). **Joao** teaches wherein the part replacement information is information related to labor charges of the parts supplier (page 22, paragraphs 0296-0297,0299). Having the cited analogous art at the time the invention was made, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to add part replacement capability to **Gormley**'s invention for having available vehicle replacement parts as taught by **Joao**'s invention in order to provide service to operators when they bring their vehicles for servicing.

***Conclusion***

5. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

**Chen et al.** (US 6,838,977) teach Apparatus for manufacturing management using a wireless device; and

**Cherrington et al.** (US 5,657,233) teach Integrated automated vehicle analysis.

6. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Md S. Elahee whose telephone number is (571) 272-7536. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon to Fri from 8:30am to 5:00pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Fan Tsang can be reached on (571) 272-7547. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

M.E.  
MD SHAFIUL ALAM ELAHEE  
June 30, 2006



FAN TSANG  
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER  
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2600